

## REMARKS

Claims 1-11 constitute the pending claims in the present application. Claim 3 was withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 2, 6-9 and 11 have been amended. Amendments presented in this reply are made to expedite prosecution of the claims in the present application and should not be viewed as acquiescence to the Examiner's positions. Applicant reserves the right to pursue claims of similar or differing scope in future applications.

No new subject matter has been added, and the amended claims should not necessitate an additional search. Support for the amended claims can be found in the application and claims as originally filed. For example, support for the amendments to the claims regarding "an internal spring activation element" and "an internal release activation element" can be found in claims 1 and 9 as originally filed.

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's conclusion that claim 6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The issues raised by the Examiner in the Office Action are addressed below in the order they appear in the prior Action.

### Interview

Applicant and Applicant's agent, Kathleen Ehrhard, thank the Examiner for the personal (Applicant) and telephonic (Applicant's agent) interview granted on December 6, 2005. Applicant brought a model of a low-force release mechanism of the subject application and demonstrated how it is operated.

Applicant's agent discussed with the Examiner amending the specification to include antecedent basis for the terms listed in the Office Action. Applicant has

"Interview  
Record OK"  
AL 7/19/06